

Remarks

The Specification has been amended to address the drawing objection and to address the objection due to antecedent basis. No new matter has been entered. Claims 1, 22, and 34 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. Claims 1-45 remain in the Application. Further consideration and examination is requested.

The Specification was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(D)(1) for failure to provide antecedent basis in the Specification for the claim language. The Applicant believes there is sufficient support as previously noted but the Specification has been amended to add the language of claim 34's preamble, as filed, into the paragraph beginning on page 18, line 5 to make the specification more consonant with the claim language as filed and current. Accordingly, no new matter has been entered. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.84(P)(5). While Applicants believe there is clearly Specification support for Fig. 3 as the ref. char. 13 is described with respect to Fig. 1, the Specification has been amended to conform the description of Fig. 3 to match exactly Fig. 3 as filed to make consonant. Accordingly, no new matter has been entered. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 14-29, 32-41, 44 and 45 were rejected as obvious in view of Aoki and Uchihashi. Claims 9-13, 30, 31, 42, and 43 were rejected as obvious over Aoki, Uchihashi, and Rui. While Applicant is not sufficiently convinced that the combination of references sufficiently enable the realization of Applicant's claimed invention. For instance, in AoK1 [170] Aoki refers to "known techniques" but not state what they are

or where they exist and there is no proof that they even exist or work. It is just conjecture to fill in a missing void. In Aoki [0168], Aoki discusses "context aware" systems but again does not disclose which systems or how one would integrate such a system into Aoki. Nonetheless, to further prosecution, Applicant has amended claim 1 to further distinguish and define the invention over the art made of record. Applicant has added the limitation of "wherein the communication provider includes a user manager configured to maintain a set of user profiles for the respective individuals, the user profiles including permission profiles." Support for this limitation is found throughout the specification and in particular page 29, lines 34-35 and page 37, lines 34-35. This limitation is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the art made of record. As noted on page 37, line 35 and carrying over onto page 38, a permission profile may pertain to an interest thread or to an object or an individual. The permission profile provides several benefits as noted. In particular, as the permission profile is for each individual, the individual permissions allow a user to keep their actions and presence from being detected. For instance, one may not want a private conversation detected and then separate and tracked as in Aoki. An interest thread detector, as describe in Aoki at [0112]-[0120] and [0168]-[0170], cannot monitor the attributes or actions of such individuals (see page 38, lines 13-16). Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, is inventive over the art made of record and withdrawal of the rejection for claim 1, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 22 and 34 have been similarly amended as with claim 1 to include the limitations of "maintaining a set of user profiles for each of the individuals" and "including communicating a user profile for each of the individuals, each user profile including a permission profile." Accordingly, claims 22 and 34 are also believed patentable over the art made of record and withdrawal of the rejection for claims 22

and 34, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The respective remaining dependent claims are believed patentable based on the patentability of their respective parent independent claim. Withdrawal of the remaining rejections under 35 USC 103(a) for all references and allowance of claims 1-45 is respectfully requested.

As this is a proposed amendment, if the Examiner agrees and feels comfortable in making an Examiner's amendment to facilitate the resolution of this Application, Applicant is willing to permit such.

If the Examiner has any questions, she is requested to contact the Applicants representative at the phone or email noted below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Timothy F. Myers  
Reg. No.: 42,919  
Hewlett Packard Co.  
Intellectual Property Dept.  
1000 NE Circle Blvd. MS 422B  
Corvallis, OR 97330  
541-715-4197  
tim.myers@hp.com